

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 15, 21, and 29 are allowable. However, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24, 26, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Inoue et al.* (U.S. 2003/0067579), claims 2, 10, 17, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Inoue et al.* in view of APA, claims 23 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Inoue et al.* in view of *Youn* (US 2002/0089485). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." The Office Action admits that *Inoue et al.* is completely silent as to applying a second voltage for electric field alignment of the ferroelectric liquid crystal using leakage current of the thin film transistor due to the first voltage. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts *Inoue et al.* fails to teach or suggest applying a second voltage for electric field alignment of the ferroelectric liquid crystal using leakage current of the thin film transistor due to the first voltage.

However, the Office Action alleges that "one can not show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections are NOT based on combinations of references. The rejections of claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24, 26, 27, and 30 are all based on a SINGLE reference, i.e., *Inoue et al.*, which was admitted by the

Examiner not to teach or suggest the claimed features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Even if *In re Keller* and *In re Merck & Co.* were to be interpreted broadly as to include rejections based on combinations of various methods disclosed in a single reference, Applicant respectfully asserts that the two methods disclosed in *Inoue et al.* can not be combined. In particular, MPEP 2145(X)(D)(2) states that it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination.

In the first method, the gate bus line voltage is floating (paragraph [0178] of *Inoue et al.*) and therefore, no voltage is applied to the gate line. However, in the second method, 5V is applied to the gate bus line (paragraph [0180] of *Inoue et al.*). Page 3 of the Final Office Action alleges that the first and second methods disclosed in *Inoue et al.* can be combined to suggest the claimed features in the present invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that the second method teaches away from the first method at least because of the two contradictory conditions disclosed in the two methods of *Inoue et al.*

Furthermore, page 4 of the Final Office Action alleges that “the only thing that *Inoue et al.* does not explicitly say is that the leakage current is what is generated when the TFT is in a floating state.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Page 4 of the Office Action alleges that “leakage current is generated when the TFT is in a floating state,” and cites to *Harrington* (US 4,943,537). Applicant respectfully asserts that this allegation is completely unrelated to the claimed feature. Although *Harrington* and the first method of *Inoue et al.*, in combination, may teach generation of leakage current when the TFT is in a floating state, and although the second method of *Inoue et al.* may teach applying a first voltage to the gate line, Applicant respectfully

asserts that *Inoue et al.* and *Harrington* are completely silent as to leakage current of the thin film transistor generated due to the first voltage, as required by independent claim 1, and as admitted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Final Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of features recited by claim 1 are allowable, and hence independent claims 7, 16, and 22, are allowable for similar reasons. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken singly or combination, fails to teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited by at least independent claims 1, 7, 16, and 22, and hence dependent claims 2-5, 8-14, 17-20, 23-28, and 30.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: June 7, 2007

CUSTOMER NO.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202-739-3000

Fax: 202-739-3001